

**DRAFT**  
**Technical Issues Committee (TIC)**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**13 June 2006**

**Attendees:**

Dan Odenweller, Central Valley Water Quality Control Board  
Chris Linneman, Summers Engineering  
Dawit Tadesse, State Water Resources Control Board  
Dania Huggins, Central Valley Water Board  
Adam Sutkis, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)  
Bill Croyle, Central Valley Water Board  
Melissa Morris, Central Valley Water Board  
Sandy Nurse, Sierra Foothill Laboratory  
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk  
Marshall Lee, Department of Pesticide Regulation  
John Swanson, Central Valley Water Board  
Don Weston, UC Berkeley  
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission  
Peter Halpin, CalTest Laboratory  
Bill Thomas, Southern San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition  
Jim Atherstone, South San Joaquin Irrigation District  
Bill McKinney, East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition  
Tina Lunt, Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition  
Margie Lopez Read, Central Valley Water Board

**Current Action Items**

1. TIC members should review the Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #5, which will be considered for consensus at the July TIC meeting.
2. The Sediment Focus Group Recommendation #2, regarding frequency and timing of sediment toxicity samples needs to be re-evaluated by the Focus Group and considered for consensus at the July TIC meeting.
3. The Triggers Focus group is continuing to work on recommendations for Assessment Completeness, and on the Options Table, and will consider the value of making recommendations for failed tests and for flow and load requirements.
4. The CVRWQCB staff will solicit comments from various programs at the CVRWQCB regarding Triggers Focus Group Recommendations 2-5, and for Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #1. These will be presented at the 11 July 2006 meeting, if possible.
5. The Laboratory Round Table Focus Group will continue to develop recommendations to present at the 11 July 2006 meeting.

## Meeting Summary

- I. Announcements:** It was announced that the Time Allowance for MRP Plan revisions is no longer subject to comment from the TIC. Language was placed in the Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver that made the time allowance a matter that will be at the discretion of the Executive Officer.
- II. Critical Path:** There was a brief review of the critical path, and the uncertainty about certain topics and where they fit with the TIC and Focus Groups. These included topics such as 'submittal of raw data', 'signatory responsibility', timing of report submittals', 'options for aerial photographs', and electronic data submittal. There was some assignment of these topics to Focus Groups although the Water Board staff will still need to consider whether or not they are technical issues or purely policy issues. More information will be provided regarding this.
- III. EDD Submittals.** Stephen Clark presented to EXCEL files with the electronic data submittals specifically used for toxicity data for two coalitions with which Pacific Eco Risk has a contract. The discussion for this presentation could be summarized as follows:
  - A. Currently both sets of reporting formats could meet the Irrigated Lands Program requirements.
  - B. There still needs to be a crosswalk to link the laboratory software that is used for toxicity analyses and the SWAMP database
  - C. There currently is not means to record the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD), which could provide more information. The suggestion was made by some TIC attendees to add an additional field to the SWAMP comparable database to record the PMSD.
- IV. Comparisons and objectives of Electronic Data Submittals and a Cost Information.** Melissa Morris provided information regarding the requirements for the electronic data submittal for the Irrigated Lands Program. Information regarding the number of fields that utilize meta-data, which holds information that can be more easily entered by copy and paste, vs the fields that must be entered individually. Costs for electronic data submittals were also provided by Dania Huggins, which was a summary from some of the commercial laboratories that perform work for the Coalitions at this time.
- V. Triggers Focus Group Recommendations.** Final copies of Trigger Focus Group recommendations 2, 3 and 4 were distributed to the TIC attendees. The request was made by TIC members that CVRWQCB staff provide comment regarding these recommendations at the next TIC meeting in July.

Stephen Clark presented the Focus Group Recommendation #5 regarding Source Identification Follow Up for toxicity tests. This item will be considered for consensus at the July meeting.

- VI. **Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation.** The Sediment Toxicity Focus Group presented Recommendation #1 – recommendations for follow-up activities to observed sediment toxicity. It should be noted that these recommendations pertain solely to the species *hyalella* and not to *chironomus tentans*. This item was being presented for the second time, and consensus was reached by the TIC for it's referral as a recommendation to the CVRWQCB staff in the MRP.

Sediment Focus Group recommendation #2 regarding timing and frequency of sampling was presented at the TIC. There was considerable discussion regarding this item, especially regarding the issues of timing during the winter season and frequency of samples that should be collected. The recommendation needs to be re-evaluated by the Focus Group and considered for consensus at the July TIC meeting.

- VII. **Triggers Focus Group Pending Recommendations.** There remain three topics that the Triggers Focus Group will be working on with respect to future recommendations for the MRP. These are those of 1) Assessment Completeness, 2) Flow and Load language, 3) Recommendations when there are laboratory failures in toxicity tests.

There remains considerable interest by the Focus Group in providing comment on studies that are used to identify numeric interpretation of Basin Plan narrative objectives. However, this can take place after the MRP Recommendation process, as water quality standards will not be listed in the MRP.

**Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be held on **11 July 2006**. It is anticipated that the remaining recommendations can be covered in a 9:00 to 12:30 meeting.

**STATUS of Previous Action Items**

1. TIC Members will develop alternative language to address concerns expressed about the Tentative MRP, page 8, last paragraph on Management Practices implementation. *(Item from February meeting – no recommendations received; no action has taken place)*
2. The SWAMP program will work with the Irrigated Lands Coalitions to 1) develop a crosswalk between ToxCalc and SWAMP, 2) provide training for utilizing the database, QAPP development, and 3) to solicit constructive comments and suggested changes for modifications that can be made to the database. *(Margie Lopez Read will communicate with Val Connor regarding the status of the crosswalk and training opportunities. No comments or suggestions received to date)*
3. TIC members wish to work on re-wording the ILP QAPP so that it is better coordinated with the SWAMP QAPP. A focus group (laboratory?) discussion for this will be arranged. *(Staff prepared a comparison table between the two QAPPs, and this was presented at the 9 May 2006 TIC meeting)*

4. TIC members are going to provide comment on the studies that are used to provide numeric interpretation of narrative quality objectives. The appropriate focus group may be the Triggers Focus Group. *(This was discussed at the 9 May 2006 meeting, and at the 13 June meeting)*
5. The Triggers group will continue to expand upon and improve the Options Table for storm water that was presented, and to draft up Problem Statements and language for a recommendation. *(no additional information has been submitted by members of the Focus Group)*
6. Language in the Tentative MRP will need to be clarified by staff so that the submittal of data for the ILP is consistent with SWAMP requirements . *(to be added by Staff with next version of a tentative MRP)*
7. Stephen Clark of Pacific EcoRisk, and Sandy Nurse of Sierra Foothill Labs will work on developing cost-estimates for a laboratory to submit electronic data in a SWAMP comparable format. *This was completed and presented at the 13 June 2006 meeting.*
8. Water Board staff will organize a presentation by Fish and Game regarding the Bioassessment project in Central Valley agriculture lands. *(This is tentatively postponed until the MRP recommendation process can be completed.)*
9. CCP will provide recommendations to staff about comment tracking protocols and methods to enhance readability of subsequent MRP recommendations/revisions from the TIC and Staff. *(to take place in near future)*
10. Staff and the TIC will further discuss the term “source” in a future meeting to ensure that there is shared meaning on the term and that there is clarity on it’s use. *(ideas for language alternatives were shared via email communications and language was modified for the TIC focus group recommendations presented at the 9 May 2006 meeting.*
11. Focus groups will continue to meet to provide proposed recommendations for the 11 April meeting. *(done and will be continued)*
12. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide comments regarding the TIC Recommendation #1 at the 9 May 2006 TIC meeting. If there are questions or concerns from staff regarding the recommendation they can be discussed at that time. *(This was completed at the 13 June 2006 meeting)*
13. Central Valley Water Board Staff will re-introduce to the TIC the objectives behind the requirement for utilizing a SWAMP comparable format at the 9 May meeting. *(This did not occur, due to lack of time availability. The discussion will occur at a later date).*

14. Stephen Clark will work with the Laboratory Round Table to provide a comparison of the types of entries required by the SWAMP comparable database with a minimal submittal that might be considered necessary for compliance evaluation with the ILP. Real world examples of data entries will be used to the extent feasible. *This was completed at the 13 June 2006 meeting.*
15. Comments received on Triggers Group Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 will be addressed by the Focus Group, and the revisions will be recirculated to the TIC with the goal of ratifying these Recommendations on 9 May 2006. *(Done)*
6. Triggers Focus Group will consider developing recommendations for the scenario of a failed toxicity test and appropriate follow-up in order to address comments regarding TIC Recommendation #1. *(action still pending)*
7. Triggers Focus Group will work on minor language changes to the Recommendations #2-4, for which there was agreement by the TIC to forward them to Water Board staff.
8. FG Recommendation #5 (appended to these meeting notes) discussions will continue, with consideration for agreement, at the 13 June TIC meeting
9. FG Recommendation #6 will be routed to the entire TIC by email to see if any comments are made. If only minor changes are requested or suggested, the recommendation will be forwarded to Water Board staff as a comment to the tentative Conditional Waiver documents.
10. Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #1 was presented at the 13 June 2006 meeting, for approval by the TIC.